## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

V.	Plaintiff(s)	Case No.  District Judge Susan J. Dlott  UNIT DISCOVEDY DLAN				
	Defendant(s)	: JOINT DISCOVERY PLAN : :				
	•	hrough their respective counsel, and hereby jointly ursuant to the Court's Pretrial Procedure Outline.				
_	onducted their discovery conference	ee on				
1. The P	MAGISTRATE CONSENT  e Parties:					
	unanimously consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c).					
	do not unanimously consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c).					
	unanimously give contingent consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c), for trial purposes only, in the event that the District Judge assigned is unavailable on the date set for trial (e.g. because of other trial settings, civil or criminal).					

<u>R</u>	RULE 26(A) DISCLOSURES				
di m	There are no changes that need to be made in the timing, form, or requirement for disclosures under Rule 26(a). All disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(1) have been made by the parties hereto or will be made by the time of the scheduled Preliminary Pretrial Conference.				
		rties agree to delay the initial disclosure until The e of delay is			
		to give the Court time to rule on the pending dispositive motion.			
		·			
<u>D</u>	<u>ISCC</u>	OVERY ISSUES AND DATES			
D	iscov	ery will need to be conducted on the issues of			
	he par	rties recommend that discovery			
	•	need not be bifurcated			
		should be bifurcated between liability and damages			
		should be bifurcated between factual and expert			
		should be limited in some fashion or focused upon particular issues which relate to			
D	Disclosure and report of plaintiff expert(s) by				
D	Disclosure and report of defendant expert(s) by				
D	Discovery cutoff				
A	Anticipated discovery problems				
		None			

## 4. <u>LIMITATIONS ON DISCOVERY</u>

A.	Changes in the limitations on discovery			
		Extension of time limitations (currently one day of seven hours) in taking of depositions to		
		Extension of number of d	epositions (currently 10) permitted to	
		Extension of number of in	terrogatories (currently 25) to	
		Other:		
		None		
В.	Protective Order			
		A protective order will likely be submitted to the Court on or before		
		The parties currently do not anticipate the need for a protective order. If the parties subsequently deem that one is necessary, they will submit a joint proposed order to the Court. Such order will be in compliance with <i>Procter &amp; Gamble Co. v. Bankers Trust Co.</i> , 78 F. 3d 219 (6th Cir. 1996).		
5.	<u>OTH</u>	OTHER COURT ORDERS UNDER RULE 26(C) OR RULE 16(B) AND (C)		
	The plaintiff anticipates the need for the Court to set a deadline to allow for the amendment of the complaint to			
		add parties.		
		add additional claims.		
		add factual allegations to support original claim(s).		
			·	
G:				
Signatures:	Attori	ney for Plaintiff(s)	Attorney for Defendant(s)	
	Attorney for		Attorney for Defendant(s)	